Table of Contents

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: NOVEMBER 15 - 17, 1993

OREGON STATE REPORT

DECEMBER 13, 1994

FINAL

Prepared for:

Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

THE ORKAND CORPORATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

APPENDIX A - State of Oregon Exhibits

OREGON STATE REPORT
Site Visit November 15 - 17, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name:	FSMIS (Food Stamp Management Information System)
Start Date:	Not available
Completion Date:	1976
Contractor:	Not applicable
Transfer From:	Not applicable
Cost:	
Actual:	$Not available
Projected:	$Not available
FSP Share:	$Not available
FSP %:	%Not available
Number of Users:	1,524
Basic Architecture:	
Mainframe:	Amdahl 1400
Workstations:	IBM 32xx terminals
Telecommunications Network:	T1 and T2 circuits, 56 KB
System Profile:	
Programs:	Food Stamp

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Department of Human Resources (DHR) administers the Food Stamp Program (FSP). The program is state administered. The Department is essentially an umbrella agency under which the following divisions are located:

- Adult and Family Services Division (administers the Food Stamp, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Medicaid (MA), JOBS, Day Care, and Refugee Programs)
- Employment Division
- Children's Services Division
- Senior and Disabled Services Division (administers the Food Stamp Program for SSI, elderly, blind and disabled population)
- Mental Health Division
- Vocational Rehabilitation Division
- Health Division
- Special Programs

The Adult and Family Services Division (AFS) is the lead division for Food Stamp Program policy and operations. The Senior and Disabled Services Division (SDSD) has a separate training program and separate field services, but takes its direction regarding Food Stamp Program policy from AFS.

There are 116 offices that determine food stamp eligibility. AFS controls 52 of these, 26 are SDSD offices, and 38 are local county area Agencies on Aging (AOA). Although the AOA offices are not staffed with State employees, AOA staff utilize the Food Stamp Management Information System (FSMIS) for food stamp application processing.

Oregon's unemployment rate has been relatively stable in recent years. In 1987, the unemployment rate was 6.2 percent. Unemployment decreased each year between 1982 and 1990, reaching a 1990 rate of 5.5 percent, before rising slightly to 6.0 percent in 1991.

The October 1992 report, *The Fiscal Survey of States*, provides the following information compiled by the National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Oregon's nominal expenditure growth for fiscal year (FY) 1993 was between 5.0 and 9.9 percent; the national average for expenditure growth was 2.4 percent.

- State government employment levels in Oregon increased by 0.01 percent. This change differed in direction from the national average 0.60 percent decrease in State government employment.

- The regional outlook indicated that economic growth is slow in the Far West region. The regional weighted unemployment rate of 8.8 percent was slightly higher than the national average of 7.8 percent. The per capita regional personal income increase of 1.6 percent was less than the national average of 2.4 percent; however, Oregon itself had below national average unemployment and above national average per capita personal income gain.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

The Food Stamp Program is operated by the Adult and Family Services Division, with additional support from the Senior and Disabled Services Division. The Food Stamp Management Information System and other systems supporting FSP, AFDC, and Medicaid are maintained by the Information Systems (IS) section within AFS. The mainframe is located within the Data Center that reports directly to the Director of DHR. The Data Center supports all of the divisions within the umbrella agency. FSMIS users can be found within AFS, SDSD, and the local county area Agencies on Aging.

Both AFS and SDSD have separate field operations, budgeting and accounting, and system support groups. All costs incurred by SDSD, however, are reported to the AFS Management Services Section which is responsible for the allocation of costs among programs and cost reporting to FNS.

Although the two divisions have separate training programs, they coordinate all training efforts to maintain continuity in administering FSP.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

Over the last four years, FSP participation has increased from 91,000 to 114,000 households; individual participation has increased from 213,000 to nearly 265,000. This caseload is served by FSMIS. AFDC and MA participation reflects a similar increase, while the General Assistance (GA) population has remained small. The growth in MA participation is attributable to changes in the qualifying poverty level for MA under the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1987.

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has improved from 11.6:1 in 1988 to 14.4:1 in 1992.

Oregon's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased.[1]

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

PROGRAM	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	43,651	43,743	38,948	33,818	32,877
Individuals	120,026	116,718	109,637	92,743	90,146
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA (SDSD)					
Individuals	2,134	2,121	1,998	2,268	2,377
FSP (FSMIS)					
Households	114,214	102,768	93,322	91,333	N/A
Individuals	264,857	240,405	216,395	213,217	N/A
Medicaid (CMS)	96,246	68,671	48,854	60,033	51,499

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	$165.18	$159.57	$149.61	$137.01	$132.32

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Oregon's FSP administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.[2] The data indicate that total administrative costs increased each year from 1988 to 1992. It also shows that the average cost per household fluctuated in this time period.

[1] The number of households and benefit amounts for AFDC, Foster Care, GA and Medicaid use data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year. FSP data was provided by FNS after review of the draft version of this report and extracted from NDB V3 System reports.

[2] The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are derived from data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* for each year.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	$15,717,686	$14,824,410	$13,264,123	$13,174,425	$12,305,888
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$11.47	$12.02	$11.84	$12.02	$11.44

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

Since the existing system has been in place for over 17 years, changes in staffing, error rates, and claims collections are not indicative of the performance of FSMIS. Enhancements have been made to FSMIS and other systems that support the Food Stamp Program to improve FSP effectiveness and efficiency. The greatest improvements have been made to claims collections, including the addition of staff and other non-system related changes in the procedures.

2.4.1 Staffing

The number of State staff serving the FSP population in the field has remained static over the last five years as caseloads have increased.

Staff for AFS and SDSD include:

- AFS: There are 632 eligibility workers (EW), 42 EW supervisors, 17 district staff, and 397 clerical staff. There are 20 people on call, with 23 vacancies and 42 temporary full-time equivalents. These personnel are located within the 52 AFS offices.

- SDSD: There are 436 positions, including clerical, caseworkers, and management staff. This number does not include the positions within the Agencies on Aging that serve FSP clients.

FSMIS has not had an apparent impact on staffing, although DHR staff do not believe the caseload increase could have been handled without automated support.

Caseworkers are generic, as is the application form.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

Of the fourteen provisions shown in Appendix A, two were not implemented on time. These were related to the combined initial allotment. The State has not yet implemented these provisions which required very significant changes to the system. Implementation of these provisions would mean that other system projects could not be implemented. Other enhancements are planned and will be implemented before the new system is implemented.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Oregon's official combined error rate, as indicated in Table 2.4, has declined significantly between 1988 and 1991, rising again in 1992.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	9.21	8.02	8.28	9.28	9.98

Oregon error rates have been below the national average for the combined error rate for the last five years shown above (except 1988 when it was slightly above the national rate). These error rates are drawn from a sample of cases from both types of field offices -- Adult and Family Services and the Senior And Disability Support Division.

Error rates began to increase between 1991 and 1992. While there are no definitive data that identifies why this increase has occurred, quality control staff suggested that caseload increases and a decreased sample size may have been reflected in this increase. Most errors are due to a failure to act on reported information, follow up on incomplete information, or correctly apply policy. More errors occur after intake than during intake. Agency-caused errors accounted for 69 percent of all errors in 1992[3], with the majority of these due to not applying reported information. The majority of client caused errors are caused by unreported information.

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Oregon's claims collected as a percentage of claims established declined from 1989 to 1990. Steady improvement began in 1991 when additional recovery staff were added.

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of collections and the percentage of claims established that were collected. During these years, the dollar value of claim collections increased each year. A separate Overpayment Recovery System

[3]Per FS QC Annual Report, FY 1992, issued 10/1.

supports claims collection. By using a number of aggressive changes in staffing, piloting the IRS recoveries pilot, and employing writs of garnishment versus clerk of the court actions, Oregon has been able to increase collections dramatically in 1993. As of September 30, 1993, $3.27 million had been collected in food stamp claims, up from $2.6 million for all of 1993. This increase is due largely to the IRS pilot. FSMIS and the Overpayment Recovery System have had little impact on the number of claims collected.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	$4,458,240	$4,348,248	$3,919,269	$2,657,958	$2,697,541
Total Claims Collected	$2,610,112	$2,177,355	$1,921,143	$1,653,225	$1,416,530
As a % of Total Claims Established	58.5%	50.1%	49.0%	62.2%	52.5%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

Oregon does not have a Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certified system, nor does its system meet the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) Model Plan Requirements. A major system development effort that would have enabled the State to meet Federal requirements was cancelled in the late 1980s. Another effort is underway to develop an integrated systems approach with statewide implementation expected in approximately three years.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

FSMIS is a stand-alone system that supports the Food Stamp Program. FSMIS interfaces with the Client Management System (CMS), the Overpayment Recovery System, the Client Directory, the Client Notice System (CNS), the Support Enforcement System (SS), and the Disqualified Recipient System (DRS).

3.1 System Functionality

The Food Stamp Program is primarily supported by FSMIS which was implemented over 17 years ago as a stand-alone food stamp system. Another system, referred to as CMS, supports AFDC and Medicaid eligibility. Over the years, subsidiary systems have been

developed to enable these programs to provide assistance in accordance with most Federal and State requirements. Oregon will continue to enhance the existing systems to the degree feasible to improve field service efficiency and program performance and will do so until a new system has been implemented. The system functionality described below, therefore, is not limited solely to FSMIS, but encompasses CMS and other subsidiary systems used in support of the Food Stamp Program.

There are 116 field offices that provide food stamp services, of which 88 are under the direction of the Adult and Family Services Division and the Senior Services Division. Each division has separate field services sections, but ultimately both divisions report to the Director of DHR, the umbrella agency.

There are terminals or personal computers (PCs) for most workers in the field offices.

- ***Registration.*** Upon receipt of a signed application form from the applicant, clerical staff perform the following searches on all household members based on name, Social Security Number (SSN), CMS case number, and other qualifying information as needed:

  - FSMIS - to determine whether the individual is currently participating or has participated within the last 12 months in FSP.

  - Disqualified Recipient System (DRS) - to determine whether the individual has been disqualified from participation in FSP.

  - CMS - to determine whether the individual is participating in the AFDC or Medicaid Programs. Searching CMS is optional, and the capability to copy individual records from CMS to FSMIS has only recently been implemented (November 1993). With this capability, it is expected that workers will increasingly choose to search the CMS database.

  The eligibility worker reviews all potential matches. If a record exists in CMS, the existing individual information (name, SSN, mailing address, residency, personal information, county, language, and whether the individual is required to report monthly or quarterly) can be moved into the food stamp record. CMS does not use the SSN as the case number, but instead uses a case number that is computer generated. The DRS file contains those individuals within Oregon who have been disqualified for food stamp fraud and the old disqualified recipient database. An existing record for an individual in DRS can be brought into FSMIS.

  Clerical staff determine whether an intake interview or a recertification interview is required and schedule the interview. Receptionists also screen applicants to identify those in need of expedited benefit issuance. All scheduling is done by the clerical staff and performed manually.

- ***Eligibility Determination.*** Eligibility workers will conduct the interview (one half hour is standard), review the application, obtain verifications, and perform on-line inquiries of other databases before entering the application information into the system.

  The determination of eligibility is, therefore, both worker and system determined. The system, however, calculates the benefit amount. If the worker begins to enter the application information and realizes that more information is needed, the data that have already been entered cannot be saved or pended. If the worker exits the system without completing the application entry all data entered thus far will be lost. For this reason workers make sure all of the information has been obtained and verifications received before beginning the application entry function. Some workers provide the completed worksheet to data entry personnel rather than enter the information themselves. This is at the discretion of each branch office.

  Approximately 90 percent of all applicant information can be entered into two data entry screens. For the remainder of the applications, a total of four screens may be used. Immediate on-line edits are performed on the data entered. The data entry sessions are real time on-line to the mainframe. As many changes as are needed throughout the day can be entered into the case on the system. Each time a change is made, however, a turnaround document is automatically printed. The worker is not required to file this turnaround document. If the worker does not perform data entry, however, the turnaround document is used to make the changes that are input by data entry. A project to create an on-line history of all changes is being piloted in one office with the goal of eliminating the turnaround documents.

  There are no system required verifications. Workers do not enter into FSMIS whether a verification has been reviewed or the type of verification reviewed.

  FSMIS sends a notice to individuals 45 days prior to their date of recertification requesting the client to indicate that benefits are still needed and submit a request for continuing certification and to schedule an interview. If the client does not respond, another notice is sent indicating that benefits will end. Recertification interviews are scheduled only when requested by the client.

- ***Benefit Calculation.*** FSMIS calculates the net food stamp monthly income, determines the pro rata amount if it is a partial month, and calculates the net allotment of benefits.

- ***Benefit Issuance.*** The primary issuance method is to mail coupons directly from the central office of AFS. Coupons are stuffed manually into envelopes that are automatically labeled by the system.

  Manual authorization to participate (ATP) cards are issued in local offices for expedited and replacement benefits. The ATPs are manually typed and the worker

enters the reason code, benefit month and year, case number, ATP number, and replacement benefit serial number into FSMIS. This facilitates reconciliation of issuance.

The system provides an on-line display of the last 12 months of issuance history and, for replacement issuances, links the document numbers of the original and replacement issuances.

Expedited issuance is possible within five days. Oregon has not been sued for failure to comply with this requirement.

Replacement issuances can be entered on-line by the worker and can be replaced either through the normal coupon issuance process or by preparing an ATP.

In Portland, elderly persons and those who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and food stamp benefits receive a check. This is a demonstration that has been in place for 15 years.

- ***Notices.*** FSMIS uses the Client Notice System to provide notices for food stamp clients. Notices are provided for all key events and most of these are fully automated and require no input from the worker. For instances where benefits are decreased or an applicant is denied, the worker is required to enter in reason codes and other information as appropriate. The notice is prepared by the Client Notice System and mailed from the central office. Workers do not receive copies of the notices and a facsimile of the notice is not available on the system. However, the worker is able to see the notice history for the last two years, indicating the type of notice sent and the reason codes, etc. If there are worker comments on the notice, this information is also maintained by the system and can be viewed by the worker.

- ***Claims System.*** A separate Overpayment Recovery System is used to track the claim status.

  The worker receives an overpayment request verification of income from employers. The worker forwards the information on the claim and the employer verification letter to the overpayment writer located in the branch office or in the regional office.

  The overpayment writer calculates the overpayment amount using a PC-based calculation module (one each for AFDC and FSP). The calculation is printed and the total amount is entered into a cover sheet for the claim information with a reason code for the overpayment. This is sent to the Overpayment Recovery Unit located in the central office. There the information is keyed into the mainframe system which generates an initial notice based on the reason code. If the case is still open, recoupment starts after the first notice. If the case has been closed, a series of four notices are sent before court action is taken.

Table of Contents

Former clients with outstanding balances who are earning income can be identified

the field staff utilize a PC support system for tracking the results of the wage matches. IRS match results are not provided to field staff but are investigated by central office staff. IEVS matches are provided in monthly and quarterly printouts. Workers are required to investigate certain matches, but are not required to track the results of the matches.

All IEVS discrepancies are reported to the worker for investigation. For the State wage match, only those with income more than $450 in a quarter are reported. The State utilizes tolerances on some of the matches. Once the worker has determined that a match does exist, the worker contacts the employer to obtain verification of the income reported in the match. If an overpayment has been made, the worker writes up the overpayment and submits this information with the employer verification information to the Office of Recovery.

- ***Alerts.*** There are no alerts in the system.

- ***Monthly Reporting.*** The worker determines which cases are subject to monthly or quarterly reporting. FSMIS produces and mails the monthly report forms to the recipients required to report, directing the returned forms to the caseworker. FSMIS generates warning notices to clients whose reports are not received in a timely manner and will generate notices when the case is closed due to a failure to report. The worker reviews the report, makes changes on a turnaround document if a change is indicated, recalculating the gross monthly incomes or expenses as needed. Oregon has one month retrospective budgeting, utilizing the prior month's data to calculate the budget. Those reporting are to return their report by the 10th of the current month for the prior month. This information is used to calculate the monthly budget. For clients who do not report monthly, the State bases the budget on the income that is expected to be earned in the month (one-month prospective budgeting).

- ***Report Generation.*** FSMIS generates a daily and monthly report for eligibility workers that reflects all action processed in the branch and the benefits issued, and staffing reports.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** The State provides E-mail at all levels. This is not a part of FSMIS. On-line policy manuals are provided through an on-line help system (Assist/GT) which is not under FSMIS. The on-line policy manual can be accessed using the keyboard. It covers eligibility determination, computer guide, senior services rules, and a directory of zip codes as they relate to the branches. The manual can be searched through an index, a menu, or a table of contents.

FSMIS and most other systems provide HELP screens behind each data element.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

FSMIS is a stand-alone food stamp system that is not integrated with the systems that support other assistance programs, although automated interfaces exist with CMS and other supporting systems and data can be exchanged. FSMIS utilizes VSAM files. Oregon intends to develop a database containing personnel information such as name, address, etc. that can be utilized by all assistance programs. The development of the database in DB2 has begun and completion is planned to coincide with the statewide implementation of the touch screen. However, initially, the database will not be accessed by the touch screen front end process.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

Most AFS workers (eligibility workers and clerical staff) have a PC or a terminal to use in processing applications.

The 26 State offices that are operated by SDSD, which serves the elderly, blind, and disabled population, have 104 terminals for its 436 positions (includes clerical, caseworkers, and management), reflecting a ratio of 4.19 workers per terminal.
SDSD is planning to add 41 terminals over the next two years. SDSD is not planning to utilize the touch screen portion of the system that AFS is planning to develop because the population served by SDSD (i.e., elderly, blind, and disabled) would probably encounter difficulties with this intake approach. SDSD will, however, participate in the development and use of the expert system and relational database components of the AFS IES project.

Under the direction of SDSD, the Area Agency on Aging operates 38 county offices that serve food stamp applicants and clients. The number of workstations and the number of workers is not known.

All 64 offices under SDSD have terminal access to the FSMIS mainframe system operated by DHR.

3.4 Current Automation Issues

Although Oregon has had one failed system (CASCADE), it is determined to implement a new touch screen system to replace FSMIS, which has been in place for over 17 years. The existing system, while it does not meet FAMIS and FNS Model Plan requirements, appears to be meeting the needs of the caseworkers in a timely fashion. FSMIS and other supporting systems continue to be enhanced since the new system is not expected to be implemented Statewide for a number of years.

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Oregon is currently in the planning stage of system development. The Planning Advanced Planning Document (APD) (PAPD) has been approved and a request for proposal (RFP) has been released. A contractor will be selected to develop a prototype touch screen system and prove the benefits of the approach as a part of the planning process. Once it is determined whether the approach will achieve the expected benefits, the State will submit an implementation APD for the purchase of hardware and implementation of the system statewide. This approach is different from the approach outlined for system development projects in the FNS APD Handbook 901, but it has received approval from both FNS and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Oregon's previous system development effort was cancelled by FNS in the late 1980's, after it had been 80 percent implemented. Oregon is necessarily cautious in undertaking another system development effort and is determined to proceed in a logical manner that reduces risk as much as possible.

4.1 Overview of Previous System

Information on the system that existed prior to FSMIS was not available and no staff were available who had a recollection of the prior system.

4.2 Justification for the New System

Oregon has received approval of a PAPD for an Integrated Eligibility Rules-Based Touch Screen Front End System (IES) from DHHS and FNS. Because enhanced funding is no longer available after April 1994, this system is to receive Federal funding at the 50 percent rate from both agencies. The intent of this system is to provide a front end to the existing systems.

The structure of the existing non-integrated systems has a number of negative impacts that Oregon expects to improve with the new system:

- Excessive operational costs, inefficient operations, and inability to maintain and modify the systems in a timely manner.
- Duplicate data entry and storage of clients who apply for both AFDC and food stamps.
- Limited system functionality resulting in preventable errors - workers must perform functions that could be automated.
- Inability to detect error source, making error correction difficult.

The new IES is expected to:

- Improve consistency in the application of program policy.
- Reduce the time expended by staff on the eligibility intake process so that worker time can be spent helping clients become self-sufficient.
- Improve client service and benefit delivery.
- Improve program accessibility.
- Reduce eligibility training time.
- Improve access to case data for quality control.
- Improve management reporting.
- Improve system and program management controls and operations.

The multiple systems would be integrated, eliminating duplicate data entry during the intake process as well as during on-going case management. Functions now performed by workers, such as determining eligibility and calculating monthly income and expenses, would be eliminated. Increased accessibility to client and case information will also improve the clearance process at application intake, resulting in some reduction of errors. Oregon error rates are below the national average with its old, existing systems, but those errors that are mathematical could be eliminated, reducing the error rate further. Most of the errors are related to the failure of the worker to take the necessary action. With the time saved through the elimination of duplicate data entry and the improved availability of information, it is expected that errors in this area would decrease as well.

Oregon would like to achieve client self sufficiency and hopes that the new system will provide workers time to work toward this goal.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Oregon submitted a Planning APD in November 1993 and an RFP for development in October 1993. The first phase of the project will be to develop a fully functional pilot project. This initial effort will occur in one field office. Pilot staff will devote 75 percent of their time to the development effort while maintaining a reduced workload.

After the system is demonstrated in a branch office, the pilot project will move to a medium-sized branch or to an accessible larger branch to validate performance, operations, and procedures. The contractor is expected to participate fully in training, tuning, and debugging the system and will provide time and motion studies and case error measurements. The contractor will also provide a capacity plan and performance measurements for a statewide DB2-based mainframe and a local area network (LAN)-implemented touch screen expert system with fully functional kiosks for client and worker input.

Full-scale implementation will occur after the pilot project has been accepted as successful by the State. It will occur over a 12 month period as scheduled by DHR. The contractor must ensure that the old systems continue to work effectively while implementation takes place. New data for the new system will be gathered in the course of normal daily FSP

activities. Training and hardware costs will be the responsibility of the contractor. After the pilot, the State may ask the contractor for an amended proposal if warranted by the results of the pilot project.

4.4. Conversion Approach

The specific conversion approach has not yet been determined.

4.5 Project Management

The sponsor for the project is the AFS administrator. The project manager will report directly to the Assistant Administrator for Information Systems. A project steering committee will have executive oversight. This steering committee will include representatives from all AFS organizational entities affected by the project, specifically field operations, income maintenance, DHR, the Oregon Executive Department, the Employees Union, and the Federal programs.

Three additional committees will assist in the decision making process: a technical committee for hardware and software, an operations committee to deal with operational functions and local offices, and an employee committee to deal with State employee issues. User involvement will include the field staff in the pilot office. The field services and income maintenance groups will meet at least weekly and will provide resources to the project as necessary.

4.6 FSP Participation

Food stamp personnel from the Adult and Family Services Division have been involved in the planning associated with IES. SDSD staff, representing somewhat more than one-quarter of the State FSMIS users, have not been involved.

AFS food stamp users from the field and central office policy units have been involved in the planning phase of the IES project and will continue to be involved during development. AFDC and Medicaid staff are also involved. SDSD staff that serve the elderly, blind, and disabled have not been involved. DHR will be developing and piloting the touch screen approach in one field location. Based on the performance of the system in that location and the benefit achieved, the system will then be implemented in other field offices. The contractor is expected to begin work in April 1994.

4.7 MIS Participation

Oregon plans to continue enhancing the systems currently in place while simultaneously developing a pilot project of the new IES. MIS staff and contract personnel will work on enhancements such as the "common data" project to accumulate all the data common to the various systems supporting the public assistance programs into a DB2 database. The IS section of AFS will provide a project manager, project coordinator, and two full-time positions to provide network support for the new system. It will also staff two full-time positions to provide ongoing maintenance support of the new system as it is developed and while it is undergoing interface conversion.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

Oregon is still very early in the development phase. The only problem encountered thus far was that FNS initially rejected the IES pilot project. After additional communication and face-to-face meetings between the State project management personnel and the Regional Office staff, the pilot project was approved.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

Oregon was cognizant of the Federal requirement to transfer a system if at all feasible. The State staff visited Nebraska to review its system. The State hosted a vendor conference, at which the CLEAN and MAGIC systems from California were considered for transfer. However, the State wanted a touch screen capability and a system that could serve as a front end for the existing databases. And, Oregon wanted an integrated relational model database. Oregon personnel also visited Hawaii and reviewed its IES pilot project. Although the State recognized the advantages of transferring a system, it felt that these were outweighed by the disadvantages such as the need to customize the system, outdated technology, and so on. Since the new system is in a very early stage of development, it is not possible to determine its suitability for transfer to other States.

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of the Oregon FSMIS. The description includes a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the system operating environment as well as future plans.

6.1 System Profile

- Mainframe: Amdahl 1400
- Disk: Hitachi triple density 3390 compatible
  IBM 3380 double density

- Tape: IBM 3480, IBM 3422
- Printers: IBM 3880-3 laser, IBM 4248-2 impact
- Front End: IBM 3745-410
- Workstations: IBM 32xx terminals and LANs
- Telecommunications Network: T1 and T2 circuits, 56 KB

A detailed hardware inventory is provided in Exhibit A-6.1 in Appendix A.

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

This section contains a description of the local operating environment, including maintenance, telecommunications, performance, response time, and downtime. There is also a discussion of current projects and plans for the future.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

Oregon recently had an independent audit done which compared its computer operations to similar private and public operations. The State was producing comparable service at 43 cents per unit versus $1.00 for the private companies. Batch hours are from 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. The critical DHR jobs are completed in a maximum of five hours, averaging a little over three hours.

The State has an Amdahl 1400 with four processors, using MVS/ESA operating at 55 MIPS (approximately the speed of an IBM 600E). The Hitachi drives are new triple density disks which are very low maintenance and have 32 megabytes of cache memory. The 32 megabyte cache memory has improved performance to such an extent that the State is planning to implement 32 megabytes of cache memory on the older 3380 disk drives to improve performance. There is one gigabyte of random access memory (RAM) separated into 512 megabytes and 512 megabytes extended.

There are 24 IBM cartridge tape drives and 65,000 cartridge tapes in the library. The State is concerned about the large number of tapes and is trying to move its users to disk to improve run times and decrease dependence on operator intervention and tape storage space. The objective is to have 45,000 tapes in the on-site library and to implement a silo for mounting and control.

Security is provided at the system and program level. An extensive disaster recovery plan is in place and tested twice yearly. It is always in an update state to maintain currency.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

FSMIS is composed of about 200 non-report programs and another 50 report programs. The programs are in COBOL with Assembler subroutines that handle the screens and provide selection and exclusion criteria. There is no database manager since all files are VSAM. Monthly processing takes about 16 hours but the 3 main processing jobs that are necessary for the on-line to come up are completed in 3 to 4 hours. Mass changes are implemented in 90 days. There are currently 220,331 records in the database.

There is a team consisting of one manager, two systems analysts, and two programmers, along with three contract programmer/analysts, that maintains the system. The main issue among State staff is training and access to new technology. There are many projects in Oregon involving new technology that State staff will be expected to support, yet there are no funds for training. Maintenance has also been impacted by a hiring freeze, budget cuts, staffing cuts, and workload increases.

All new applications use Knowledgeware's CASE product and are moving to LAN- based systems with relational databases accessed by the user through SQL, R-STARS, or ADPIKS. These newer technologies are devised to relieve the MIS staff of many activities and reduce the cost of maintaining the systems.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

Oregon is divided into two telecommunications regions. The northern region is serviced out of Portland by two T2 lines; the southern region is serviced out of Eugene with two T1 lines. All circuits leaving the telecommunication lines are 56 KB. These high speed lines may extend all the way to one of the major offices. Smaller offices are serviced by 9600 or 4800 baud lines. The trend is to 9600 baud as a minimum all over the State. Some lines remain analog, but the trend is to digital. There is a fiber optics network around the government complex in Salem.

The State is moving to a wide area network (WAN) with either dumb terminals or LANs in each of the 300 plus offices. The configuration depends on the type of office and what systems are needed to serve it. The trend is to Token ring and Ethernet applications.

There are 30 to 40 independent phone companies in Oregon. The State does not deal directly with these independents; AT&T and US WEST, who contract with the State to deliver telecommunications services, negotiate with the local carriers. However, in the areas serviced by the independent companies, line installation is slower and digital capability is less than in those areas serviced by the national companies.

6.2.4 System Performance

Oregon processes 137,000 completed transactions daily. This number does not represent Customer Information Control System (CICS) transactions as there could be multiple CICS transactions in each of the completed transactions. There are approximately 20

million CICS transactions a month. The system is currently running at about 65 to 85 percent capacity. The concern among the program staff is that their response time is always dependent on the next direct access storage device (DASD) or mainframe upgrade. Therefore, they would like to reduce the connection between the mainframe and productivity by implementing LANs. Some LANs have been installed around the State as advanced platforms for the new system.

Due to the use of cartridge drives, storage space is not a problem.

6.2.5 System Response

Response time is fairly stable over the State since the last hardware upgrade. Historically, response time fluctuates depending on the capacity of the central processing unit (CPU) and telecommunications lines. Today, almost no transaction takes over two seconds and 98 percent of the screens change in less than 1/2 second.

6.2.6 System Downtime

Downtime has not been an issue in Oregon for the last year. Cartridge tapes have helped cut the daily and monthly run times to more manageable timeframes. Currently, most downtime is attributed to telecommunications line problems.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Oregon has begun a planning project that will result in a pilot for a touch screen front end, a relational DB2 database, and expert system eligibility determination and benefit calculation on LANs in the 52 local offices. This system, developed using the CASE tool Knowledgeware, will feed the current FSMIS and CMS databases and the common database currently in development. The State is in the process of hiring a project manager. The pilot will be completed in 1995; the entire project will be implemented in phases through the year 2000.

The objective of the touch screen is to relieve staff from duplicate input, manual eligibility determination, benefit calculation, and other labor intensive tasks. Time saved will the be dedicated to welfare reform tasks focused toward self-sufficiency for clients, eventually reducing the client population.

The new system may not be FAMIS certified. Oregon does not see any advantage to FAMIS certification without enhanced funding and envisions delays in the approval cycle due to certification requirements that could drive up the cost of the project and extend the timeframe for implementation.

The contractor will specify the number and qualifications of State staff necessary to successfully implement the project. The State will provide MIS and FSP staff up to certain limits, but the contractor will be responsible for the success of the project. The development staff will be housed in the same office as operational field staff that are

involved in the project. The field staff will continue to service 25 percent of their caseload. This arrangement will keep the case workers in touch with their primary mission, and keep them current with regulations and processes. A previous project had workers dedicated to the project and the State felt that they lost sight of their processes and field orientation. The State will backfill both MIS and field workers that are on the project for the duration of the project.

The State has an electronic benefits transfer (EBT)/electronic funds transfer (EFT) project that has been approved.

There is a voice response pilot in two offices in the State that is scheduled to conclude in January 1994 and will be spread statewide if successful. All indications are that it has been well received by workers and clients and is saving significant time for the worker.

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION

This section addresses automated data processing (ADP) development costs and level of Federal funding, FSMIS operational costs, cost control systems and methods, and cost allocation methodologies for development and operational costs.

7.1 ADP Development Costs and Federal Funding

FSMIS was developed in the early 1970s as a stand-alone system to support FSP. This system is used to calculate benefits and track food stamp clients from application through issuance. Historical development cost data for FSMIS is unavailable. However, costs for the new IES project have been estimated in the most recent PAPD dated October 7, 1993.

The original PAPD for IES was submitted by DHR in July 1993, approved by AFDC in August 1993, and contingently approved by FNS in October 1993. The FNS approval was contingent upon DHR satisfactorily addressing certain issues and/or providing additional information. Some of the issues included:

- FNS will reimburse development expenditures at a 50 percent match rate. This was not specified in the PAPD.
- FNS needs a project budget that reflects Federal fiscal quarters and years.
- FNS wants cost allocation to be based on caseload counts.

Table 7.1, below, summarizes all expenditures expected for the entire IES project.[4]

[4] Source: 10/7/93 PAPD.

Table 7.1 IES Projected Development Expenditures

PHASE	PROJECTED COST, TOUCH SCREEN
Planning	$3,427,632
Oversight	342,763
Implementation	14,015,976
TOTAL	$17,786,371

7.1.1 IES Components

DHR is proposing a rules-based integrated eligibility determination system which will support AFDC, Food Stamp, Medicaid, and State Programs. This system will feature a

Table 7.2 IES Pilot Budget

COST COMPONENT	PROJECTED TOTAL COST
Personnel	$2,419,278
Hardware	441,446
Software	56,880
Facilities	295,975
Office Expenses	214,053
TOTAL	$3,427,632

7.2 FSMIS Operational Costs

The total ADP operational cost, as reported on the SF-269, is composed primarily of charges incurred for FSMIS but also includes allocated charges for other systems. ADP operational costs from fiscal years 1990 through 1993 are presented in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3 ADP Operational Cost

FY	FSP OPERATIONAL COST	FNS SHARE AFTER 50% FFP
1990	$1,383,316	$691,658
1991	2,057,950	1,028,975
1992	1,856,978	928,489
1993	1,545,082	772,541

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Based on 1992 FSP operating costs of $1,856,978, monthly operating costs averaged $154,748 in 1992. The average number of FSP cases monthly was 124,837 households. The cost per case -- the monthly operational costs divided by the average number of monthly cases -- was $1.23.

7.2.2 FSMIS Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

Financial and cost accounting is managed by the Fund and Expenditure Unit within DHR using several non-integrated systems and microcomputer applications. However, cost data

processed in these systems can generally be categorized as either a program or an administrative expense.

In the program category, three systems support FSP related payments: the Special Cash Payment System, the Revolving Funds System, and the Direct Provider Payment System. On a monthly basis, transactions from these systems are further processed in a cost allocation micro application and accumulated quarterly to provide input for the SF-269.

Administrative transactions include payments for personnel, supplies, services, and capital expenditures. Personal service or personnel costs are initially processed in a separate payroll system, and supplies, services, and capital expenditures are processed in the Administrative Payment System (APS), a subsystem of the AFS Budget Tracking System.

7.2.2.1 Personal Services Costs

The proper distribution of personnel costs involves several detailed routines. All employees are required to track their time using time codes in the Time Reporting System (TRS). The payroll system, which contains detailed payroll transactions, interfaces with TRS to determine how costs should be distributed according to time codes. These codes identify the cost as a direct or indirect charge. Time codes are used when the following personnel charges are charged directly to a Food Stamp Program activity:

- FSP certification/re-certification
- FSP maintenance
- FSP issuance
- OFSET (Oregon FSP Employment Transition Project)
- FSP cash-out
- FSP fraud
- FSP quality control

Unlike other personnel, ADP personnel track their time in TRS using a system request code to enable the proper allocation of these charges. The system request codes are used to track ADP personnel time spent on various system applications, some of which are charged directly to a program. A separate table in TRS automatically converts the system request code to the proper time reporting code. After all costs have been matched with the proper time code, direct and indirect payroll costs are summarized on the TRS report (WAR0020).

7.2.2.2 Administrative Payments for Supplies, Services, and Capital Outlays

All other administrative payments are processed in APS after updates are made from the Check Writing System. Every APS payment is tracked via a three part code:

- Cost Center (XX-XX) indicates organization unit responsible for the expenditure.

- Cost Center Modifier (XX) provides further identification so that costs can be direct charged to specific programs and the proper Federal match can be claimed.

- Financial Account Number (XXX.XXX) indicates the purpose of the expenditure. This code is similar to an object code.

Cost centers which accumulate costs for the Information Systems section for both personal services and supplies and services include: data entry, production control, systems development, and DHR computer charges.

Cost center modifiers which allow direct charge to a FSP activity include:

- FSP 100 percent travel reimbursement
- FSP save
- FSP agency direct mail issuance
- FSP administrative costs
- FSP investigative costs
- FSP OFSET costs

When an administrative cost cannot be charged directly to a Federal or State program, the cost center modifier 00 is used. Both direct and indirect administrative payments in this category are summarized on an APS report (WBT225).

7.3 Oregon Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section describes the methodologies used to allocate ADP development and operational costs and the mechanics for preparing the SF-269.

7.3.1 Overview of IES Development Cost Allocation Methodology

For the IES project, AFS proposes using a cost allocation (CA) methodology based on ratios derived from the branch office employee time reporting system. These ratios are based on direct hours spent by branch employees for a particular program in relation to total hours expended for all programs. For example, ratios calculated over a six month period indicated that the average CA ratios using this basis were as follows:

- AFDC - 46.95%
- FSP - 34.03%
- MA - 8.57%
- Refugee - 0.29%
- JOBS - 9.85%
- Child Care - 0.19%
- State Only - 0.12%

DHR plans to allocate actual IES expenditures using the ratios calculated for that month, but it is expected to be close to the above ratios.

7.3.2 ADP Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

Generally, ADP costs can be divided into three categories: systems development, production control, and DHR computer center billing. Systems development costs include ADP personal services, supplies and services, and capital outlays charges incurred for current system enhancements and/or development of new applications. Production control includes direct and indirect expenditures, in the same three categories, which are incurred for operating and maintaining current systems. The monthly DHR computer center bill itemizes CPU costs for running those systems. A detailed job listing itemizes costs by job number. Most of the individual job charges represent a direct charge to a Federal program.

In addition to the direct charges described above, general administration and information systems administration costs are distributed first to subunits, systems development, and production control, and then allocated to the Federal programs.

ADP operational costs that cannot be charged directly to a Federal or State program are allocated using one or more factors. Table 7.4 describes the allocation basis for each type of ADP operational cost.

Using input from the TRS and the DHR computer bill job listing, factor percentages are calculated monthly and entered into a CA micro application. Within the CA application, factor percentages are multiplied by the appropriate cost base total to determine the programs's share of that allocated cost. Direct costs are also entered into the cost allocation application. The administrative cost allocation is summarized on the *Administrative Expense Worksheet* (CAW993).

To prepare the SF-269, the CA data is fed into another micro application. Program data, as discussed in section 7.2.2, is also fed into this application and combined with the administrative data. This micro application facilitates the consolidation of column totals and also combines the monthly totals into a quarterly total for the SF-269.

Table 7.4 ADP Cost Allocation Summary

ALLOCATED COST	ALLOCATED TO:	FACTOR	FACTOR TITLE	BASIS
General Administration[5]	Production Control and Systems Development	C2	64-XX Hours worked	Percentage calculated based on number of hours worked divided by total hours * GA total cost.
Production Control - Personal Services / Supplies and Services	Federal and State programs	F9	Production Control Factor	Percentage derived from Program's share of DHR Computer Billing Job Charges * total cost.
Systems Development - Personal Services / Supplies and Services	Federal and State programs	F2	Programmers Factors	Percentage of hours reported in TRS for that program divided by total hours * total cost.
DHR Computer Center Bill	Federal and State programs	F4	DHR Billing Factors	Percentage derived from Program's share of DHR Computer Billing Job Charges + CICS Mainframe and Disk charges * total cost.

[5] Cost is redistributed to programs based on production control and systems development factors.

APPENDIX A

STATE OF OREGON

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
2.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	Y	N	N
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	2/1/92 *	Y	N	N
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	2/1/92 *	Y	N	N
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	N	N
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	N	Y	N
2.3	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames. 274.2(b)(3)	1/1/90	N	Y	N

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
3.1	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Exclusion of job stream migrant vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	N
3.2	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Exclusion of advance earned income tax credit payments. 273.9(c)(14)	1/1/89 *	Y	N	N
3.3	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	3: Increase dependent care deductions. 273.9(f)(4), etc.	10/1/88	Y	Y	N
3.4	3: Disaster Assistance Act & Non-Discretionary Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	4: Eliminate migrant initial month proration. 273.10(a)(1)(ii)	9/1/88	Y	N	N
4.1	4: Issuance	1: Mail issuance must be staggered over at least ten days. 274.2(c)(1)	4/1/89	Y	Y	N
4.2	4: Issuance	2: Limitation on the number of replacement issuances. 274.6(b)(2)	10/1/89	Y	N	N
4.3	4: Issuance	3: Destruction of unusable coupons within 30 days. 274.7(f)	4/1/89	Y	N	N

* These dates were changed after the State completed this form and the site visit occurred; therefore, the responses to these particular regulatory changes may be inaccurate.

Exhibit A-6.1
State of Oregon
Hardware Inventory

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
5995-1400A	Amdahl	Purchase	64 channels, 512 MB main storage, 512 MB expanded storage, 55 MIPS
DISK			
7880/7380	HDS	Purchase	Controllers (2) Drives (16)
7980/7390	HDS	Purchase	Controllers (1) Drives (3)
TAPE			
Reel Tape Drives	IBM	Purchase	3422 (2)
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	3480 (12)
Controllers	IBM	Purchase	3480 (3)
PRINTERS			
Laser	IBM	Purchase	3880-3 (2)
Impact	IBM	Purchase	4248-2 (1)
FRONT ENDS			
FEPs	IBM	Purchase	3745 (1)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Workstations	IBM	Purchase	32xx (6000)

Table of Contents

APPENDIX B

STATE OF OREGON

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey represent the perceptions of eligibility workers (EWs) in Oregon. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Oregon. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Oregon	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
632	63	10.0%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	38	60.3%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of EWs in Oregon. The number of responses, however, is moderately low and produces a small sample that may not be representative of the randomly selected group.

Summary of Findings

For the most part, respondents are satisfied with the computer system in Oregon. Most EWs generally think that system response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use are acceptable. Nevertheless, workers' responses indicate that significant numbers have some problems with particular features of the system. Workers also feel that the system generally has a positive impact on job satisfaction; almost 87 percent of the EWs think that the system is a great help in their jobs.

Since Oregon's current system has been operational since 1976, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	2	5.3
Good	26	68.4
Excellent	10	26.3

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	17	44.7
Good	18	47.4
Excellent	3	7.9

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	6	15.8
Sometimes	28	73.7
Often	4	10.5

Eligibility workers in Oregon generally are satisfied with system response time. Approximately 95 percent of the respondents feel that overall system response time is good or excellent. The majority thinks response time during peak periods is good or excellent; however, a large majority also believes that system response sometimes is too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	4	10.5
Often	34	89.5

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	23.7
Sometimes	25	65.8
Often	4	10.5

Nearly 90 percent of responding eligibility workers believe that the system often is available when they need to use it, but most EWs also think the system sometimes or often is down. The system downtime, however, does not seem to be intrusive enough to detract from the perception that the system generally is available.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Good	30	78.9
Excellent	8	21.1

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	34	91.9
Sometimes	3	8.1

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	32	88.9
Sometimes	4	11.1

How often is the system's data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	54.1
Sometimes	15	40.5
Often	2	5.4

Most eligibility workers think the system's data and computations are accurate. Almost 79 percent of the workers feel that the quality of the information in the system is good or excellent. Large majorities also believe that problems related to cases terminated in error and incorrect eligibility determination are rare. A significant minority feels that data in the system sometimes is obsolete.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	52.6
Sometimes	17	44.7
Often	1	2.6

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	20	52.6
Sometimes	16	42.1
Often	2	5.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	67.6
Sometimes	9	26.5
Often	2	5.9

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	83.3
Sometimes	6	16.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	75.0
Sometimes	7	19.4
Often	2	5.6

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	74.3
Sometimes	7	20.0
Often	2	5.7

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	31	86.1
Sometimes	5	13.9

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	77.8
Sometimes	7	19.4
Often	1	2.8

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	35	92.1
Sometimes	3	7.9

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	28	77.8
Sometimes	7	19.4
Often	1	2.8

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	30	78.9
Sometimes	8	21.1

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	26	74.3
Sometimes	5	14.3
Often	4	11.4

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	36.0
Sometimes	8	32.0
Often	8	32.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	9	36.0
Sometimes	13	52.0
Often	3	12.0

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	54.3
Sometimes	10	28.6
Often	6	17.1

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	30	78.9
Sometimes	6	15.8
Often	2	5.3

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	64.7
Sometimes	9	26.5
Often	3	8.8

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	10	32.3
Sometimes	14	45.2
Often	7	22.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	11	36.7
Sometimes	14	46.7
Often	5	16.7

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	75.8
Sometimes	7	21.2
Often	1	3.0

Eligibility workers generally believe that the system is easy to use, but a significant number of respondents have problems in some areas. For most functions, a majority reports rarely having difficulty; however, more than half of the respondents sometimes or often have problems monitoring the status of hearings, tracking outstanding verifications, and identifying error prone and suspected fraud cases. There also are several areas in which significant minorities report sometimes or often having problems; these include: obtaining information from the system, learning to use the system, and automatically notifying households of case actions.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	1	2.6
Sometimes	4	10.5
Often	33	86.8

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	50.0
Sometimes	13	34.2
Often	6	15.8

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	30	81.1
Sometimes	7	18.9

EWs generally think that the system positively influences job satisfaction. Almost 87 percent of eligibility workers feel that the system is a great help to them in their jobs. Half also believe that the system rarely contributes to job-related stress, and over 81 percent feel that the system usually is more helpful

implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

APPENDIX C

STATE OF OREGON

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility worker (EW) supervisors in Oregon. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in the State. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EW Supervisors in Oregon	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
42	30	61.2%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	11	36.7%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions would be representative of supervisors in Oregon. The total number of respondents, however, is low. The low response rate produces a small sample whose responses may not be representative of this random selection.

Summary of Findings

Most EW supervisors in Oregon regard the system positively and believe that it helps them in their jobs. The vast majority of EW supervisors report that system response time, availability, accuracy, and ease of use are good. There are a couple of areas, however, in which significant proportions of EW supervisors believe there are problems. EW supervisors also think that the system contributes to job satisfaction and generally supports management needs.

Since Oregon's current system has been operational since 1976, comparisons between the current and previous systems would be of limited value. Responses to comparative questions, therefore, are not solicited for systems that were implemented more than five years ago.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	7	63.6
Excellent	4	36.4

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	4	36.4
Good	5	45.5
Excellent	2	18.2

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	27.3
Sometimes	7	63.6
Often	1	9.1

EW supervisors in Oregon generally are satisfied with system response time. All of the respondents feel that overall system response time is good or excellent, but over 36 percent believe that response time is poor during peak processing periods. More than 72 percent of the supervisors also think that response time sometimes or often is too slow.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	2	18.2
Often	9	81.8

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	2	18.2
Sometimes	7	63.6
Often	2	18.2

Almost 82 percent of EW supervisors report that the system often is available when they need to use it; however, most supervisors also feel that there are instances of downtime. A majority of EW supervisors think that the system sometimes is down. This downtime, however, apparently is not intrusive enough to detract from the perception of overall system availability.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	7	63.6
Excellent	4	36.4

EW supervisors generally perceive the quality of the system's data to be acceptable. All the supervisors feel that the information in the system is good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	81.8
Sometimes	2	18.2

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	66.7
Sometimes	3	33.3

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	60.0
Sometimes	4	40.0

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	100.0

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	66.7
Sometimes	3	33.3

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	90.9
Often	1	9.1

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	100.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	9	81.8
Sometimes	2	18.2

EW supervisors generally feel that the system is easy to use. For each function discussed, a majority of the EW supervisors report rarely having difficulties in these areas. There are two areas in which significant minorities sometimes have problems: learning to use the system (33 percent) and tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms (40 percent).

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Sometimes	3	27.3
Often	8	72.7

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	72.7
Sometimes	2	18.2
Often	1	9.1

EW supervisors feel that the system contributes to job satisfaction. Almost 73 percent of respondents feel that the system often is a great help, and the same proportion thinks it rarely creates added stress in their jobs.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Good	9	81.8
Excellent	2	18.2

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	9.1
Good	9	81.8
Excellent	1	9.1

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	3	42.9
Sometimes	4	57.1

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	62.5
Sometimes	3	37.5

EW supervisors feel that the system generally supports management needs. All of the EW supervisors think that the quality of the reports produced by the system is good or excellent, and nearly 91 percent feel that technical staff support is good or excellent. The majority of EW supervisors report rarely having problems meeting Federal reporting requirements, but over 57 percent sometimes have difficulty making mass changes.

Client Service

No data are available to address client service because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Oregon's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.

Fraud and Errors

No data are available to address fraud and errors with the Oregon system because all the questions in this category compare the current and previous systems. Since Oregon's system was implemented more than five years ago, comparative questions are not applicable.